

The Times-Dispatch.

PUBLISHED DAILY AND WEEKLY AT
THE
TIMES-DISPATCH BUILDING.

BUSINESS OFFICE, NO. 816 EAST MAIN STREET.

Entered January 27, 1903, at
Richmond, Va., as second-class
matter, under Act of Congress
of March 3, 1879.

Washington Bureau: No. 501 Fourteenth
Street, Northwest, Corner Pennsylvania
Avenue.

Manchester Bureau: Carter's Drug Store,
No. 1102 Hill Street.
Petersburg Headquarters: J. D. Vesley Har-
rison's, No. 109 North Bycromore Street.

The DAILY TIMES-DISPATCH is sold
at 2 cents a copy.

The SUNDAY TIMES-DISPATCH is
sold at 5 cents a copy.

The DAILY TIMES-DISPATCH, includ-
ing Sunday, in Richmond and Manches-
ter, by carrier, 12 cents per week or 50
cents per month.

THE TIMES-DISPATCH, Richmond, Va.

BY MAIL.	One Year.	Six Months.	Three Months.
Daily, with Sun.,	\$5.00	\$2.50	\$1.25
Daily without Sun.,	\$3.00	1.50	.75
Editorial only,	2.00	1.00	.50
Weekly (Wed.),	1.00	.50	.25

All Unclaimed Communications will be
discarded.
Rejected Communications will not be
returned unless accompanied by stamp.

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1905.

The South's Progress.

In a recent issue of the Boston Transcript appeared a communication from Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, of Harvard University, on the condition of the negro race in the South, in the course of which he said that outside of the highly thrifty belt of country extending from Richmond to New Orleans the South was making little economic advance and in some cases must be going backward. We undertook to reply in general terms to this statement and cited figures to show that it was erroneous. After reading the article in the Times-Dispatch, Professor Hart addressed a letter to the editor of this paper, in which he called attention to qualifying clauses in his article and in which he referred kindly to Richmond, but still maintained that his original statement was substantially correct, and that with the exception of the territory referred to, the South was going backward instead of forward.

We could not allow this statement to go unchallenged and uncontradicted, and we took the liberty of referring Professor Hart's letter to the Baltimore Manufacturers' Record, which has made it a business for many years past to study conditions in the South and to collect statistics showing advancement in commerce and industry and in property values. Our Baltimore contemporary has generously complied with our request and has prepared for The Times-Dispatch an article in reply. Professor Hart's communication and the reply of the Manufacturers' Record will be found elsewhere in to-day's paper and they make an interesting and instructive study.

The main contention of Professor Hart is that the South as a whole and many of the particular States appear to be less prosperous than they were in 1860. This statement is peculiarly interesting as coming from a citizen of New England. It is notable that a man from the abolition section should undertake to prove and emphasize that the South was more prosperous in the days of slavery than she is forty years after the abolition. It is our purpose and the purpose of the Manufacturers' Record to show that there is no ground whatsoever for this contention, but that the South is enormously more prosperous in 1905 than it was in 1860. Professor Hart admits, however, that his statement is based on estimates and not on actual statistics, and says that he is well aware of the imperfection of such a basis. He admits that in the use of the figures of 1860, there is a complication owing to the fact that the slaves were assessed for taxes to an amount not possible to ascertain, but probably not less than a billion dollars, and that in the comparisons which he makes, he has eliminated or deducted an estimate of the amount of assessments for slaves.

Proceeding on this assumption, he says that the fifteen slave-holding States in 1860 were assessed for forty-five hundred millions, leaving out slave property, of which about twenty-four hundred millions was real estate and twenty-one hundred millions personal estate; whereas, in 1890, the total assessment was fifty-five hundred million, a gain of about twenty-five per cent., while the population had increased from twelve to twenty-two millions. That is, says he, the per capita valuation in 1860 was about \$35; in 1890, \$39, and in 1901, \$50. He further admits that while the figures of 1860 and 1890 were taken from the census reports, the figures of 1901 were taken from the World Almanac. If Professor Hart knows anything of the situation in the South, of the development in mining and manufacturing, in trade and in agriculture, he must know that from 1890 to 1901 the South gained enormously. It is absurd on its face to say that there was no gain per capita in that period.

Strangely enough in the last paragraph of his letter he cordially admits that the South as a whole is now more prosperous and more promising than at any time in its history. How he can reconcile this statement with the statement preceding and following that "the South is making little economic advance and in some cases must be going backward," we are at a loss to understand.

In its reply to Professor Hart's letter, the Manufacturers' Record says that he has overlooked the vital point that assessed values today represent far less of the real values than did assessed

values in the census of 1860. In that year, says our contemporary, the assessed value of property of the thirteen strictly Southern States was in round numbers \$3,125,000,000, and the real value \$6,240,000,000, the assessed value being eighty-two per cent. of the real value, including slaves. But in 1890, according to the Manufacturers' Record, the assessed value was only forty-one per cent. of the true value, and if this proportion is maintained today the true value of all southern property would be something like fifteen and one half billion dollars. Indeed, our Baltimore contemporary makes the bold statement that the true value of the property in the South today is almost as great as the true value of property in the whole country in 1890 and that the per capita value is considerably greater, being for the whole country in 1890, \$514, and for the South in 1901 more than \$600.

The figures are printed in detail elsewhere, and need not be repeated here, although a few significant comparisons may be made. In 1890 the bank deposits of the whole country were \$253,800,000; in the South alone in 1901 they amounted to \$745,000,000. The pig-iron production in the whole country in 1890 was \$84,474 tons; in the South alone in 1901, it was 2,743,313 tons. The cotton spindles in the whole country in 1890 were 5,035,798; in the South alone in 1901, they were 8,515,000. The value of exports in the whole country in 1890 was \$333,576,000; in the South alone in 1890, it was \$333,242,000.

In twenty years from 1880 to 1900, southern farm values increased seventy-two per cent.; capital invested in southern manufacturing increased 348 per cent.; the value of manufactured products increased 223 per cent.; the value of mineral products increased 517 per cent.; in 1901 southern cotton mills consumed more than six times the number of bales of cotton consumed in 1880, the production of pig-iron was nearly seven times as great and the production of coal more than five times as great as in 1880; railroad mileage more than doubled in twenty years, and the value of exports from southern ports increased more than seventy-seven per cent., while the assessed value of property increased more than seventy-eight per cent.

We have no idea that Professor Hart desires to do the South an injustice. His articles are written in a spirit of fairness, but it is perfectly clear even from the few figures which we have cited above that he is way off the mark. We are glad, however, that his articles have appeared, for they furnish this paper and the Manufacturers' Record and other southern newspapers the opportunity to advertise and emphasize the fact that the South has made greater progress in many respects at least than any other section, and is to-day the most promising and inviting of all sections of the Union.

Expansion and the Square Deal.

In less than three weeks the forces at work for Greater Richmond have not only shown the citizens the urgent needs of this city, but the means for obtaining those objects.

It was not difficult to convince the public that the stifling congestion of Richmond's dwellings were not only dangerous to health, destructive of comfort, but absolutely unnecessary. Not even the most intractable opponent of broad-gauged extension has been heard to object to an increase of our city limits, but many, while loudly proclaiming their belief in expansion as a principle, damn with faint praise or open and merciless criticism the practice of that expansion which will give relief where it is the most needed. The so-called conservatism, the strength of sloth and the power of custom are all arrayed against a liberal policy and a far-seeing scheme of city growth.

If "very many" were had always been hearkened to," in the words of Lord John Russell, the great Liberal, "we would still be eating acorns and wearing skins."

Richmond has sojourned long enough in the woods; and long enough eaten the bitter bread of acorns, because it was easier to do as our fathers did than to move out to the larger and fuller life that always awaits the progressive and vigorous individual city, State or nation.

Of the opportunity and advantage of liberal expansion there is also no reasonable or valid doubt; what opposition there is comes from timidity parading as patriotism or narrowness miscalling itself conservatism. The timid say that to extend the city limits, as proposed by the subcommittee, will expose the city to the risk of losing the Locomotive Works, the Chesapeake and Ohio shops and the Cedar Works. The answer is that the danger is rather conjured up by a disordered imagination than caused by a just appreciation of existing conditions. Those works are here, simply and solely because Richmond is here, and they will remain unless they are forced to go away. The life-blood of those works is the workman, whose home is here in Richmond, and not the rate of taxes paid in the county, and the presidents of those works know this so, and so will any citizen who can curb his fears long enough to think.

Again, there is no reason why the taxes of such industries should be inequitably increased, for these plants are being taken in the city not to gain their taxes, but because they lie in the path of the growing needs of the people of this community. The United States census tables show the great congestion of dwellings in Richmond, the small increase of population, and the high death rate points to only one conclusion, that Richmond needs more room. This is the need, moral and physical, which will be stifled to the obvious danger and irreparable detriment of the whole community if the Council takes a devious or dodging course on Friday night.

The only way to avoid a difficulty is to meet it. The only course to pursue is to give a square deal all around.

A square deal for the simple citizen whose health, happiness and prosperity demand more room.

A square deal to the manufacturer in the city, whose taxes make it possible

for the manufacturer in the county to have gas, water and fire protection at a nominal cost.

A square deal to those industries who will be taken in by assessing them and all others on the basis of what the plant is worth with the live blood out.

And, above all, a square deal to the principle of honest manliness that lies at the basis of our government.

Unhesitatingly and confidently, in the light of conscience, experience and history, we affirm that the greatest benefit that can come to Richmond is to give forth to the world the fact that this community has united as one man for progress on the principle of the square deal for everybody; high and low, rich and poor, employer and employee, and the accession of confidence and capital which would follow such announcement would outweigh a thousand fold any loss of individual manufacturers.

But, men of Richmond, the manufacturers will not go. They want and need a community in which confidence and common sense and common honesty are to be found. If we can give these qualities as a city, we can keep all the business we have and get all the business we can handle.

Stamp Out Tuberculosis.

This community is under obligation to Dr. J. Allison Hodges, president of the University College of Medicine, for having brought to the city Dr. William S. Thayer, of Johns Hopkins University, that he might stir up the Richmond people on the subject of tuberculosis. Dr. Thayer has made tuberculosis a special study and ranks among the first American authorities on this disease. While in Richmond he committed himself to the statement that if a case of tuberculosis is taken in hand in its earliest stages there is no reason why there should not be a perfect and permanent cure, but he added that the great work of medical science and of public sanitation should be to prevent the spread of the disease. In fine, he said that tuberculosis was a curable disease if taken in time, and as surely a preventable disease as smallpox is.

All medical experts are agreed on that point, and for us to allow the white plague to go stalking through the community without doing anything to prevent it is as reckless and as criminal as though we should allow the city to be scourged with a smallpox epidemic for failure to employ vaccination as a preventive. We must extend our territory and relieve the congestion in the city which makes conditions favorable to the development and spread of tuberculosis, and we should adopt all measures which medical science prescribes to drive the plague out and keep it out.

Single or Double Primary.

The Democrats of Norfolk have decided to have a two-days' primary election in June to select candidates for local offices, one on the 13th and a second primary on the 15th of that month. The Norfolk papers speak most approvingly of the plan, and say that if strictly complied with it will fairly determine the choice of the voters.

It will be observed that Norfolk, like Petersburg, has determined to hold a separate primary for the selection of local candidates and we are informed that all the factions within the party, and Norfolk city is never lacking in political factions, were, without an exception, in favor of a separate primary as the Democrats did not wish to entangle their local affairs with State politics.

The local committees of Norfolk and Petersburg have unanimously decided in favor of the separate primary, and it is to be hoped that the Richmond committee will do likewise. There is every argument in favor of the separate primary, and no argument worthy of serious consideration against it.

A detective who went to the Danville section to spy out the blind tigers was set upon just beyond the city limits and beaten by a white man who was doubtless one of his victims.

The curious part of it was that the weapon used was a beer bottle! We suppose the blind tiger men call it poetic justice.

In a Buffalo restaurant the other day a well dressed stranger approached a lady at one of the tables and beat her into unconsciousness before the crowd could pull him off. His graceful explanation of the assault afterwards was that he had mistaken the lady for his wife.

Russia had lots of trouble in negotiating her last war loan, while Japan's loan, on the other hand, was subscribed nine times over. Hence, Russia's alleged hope of bleeding Japan to death seems to be founded on optimism or bureaucratic hot air.

The New York police authorities are puzzled to know whether dynamite Roosevelt is a horrid desperado or merely a candidate for the foolish works.

Richmond isn't going to take very much interest in politics until the annexation question is settled and out of the way.

The flowers that bloom in the spring have made a good running start this year, tra la!

Armour's Extract of Beef

Sold only under the
Armour label, no matter
what the dealer
says.

If it isn't labeled "Armour's"
it isn't Armour's.

Our cook book
"Culinary Wrinkles"
mailed free

Armour & Company Chicago

CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTH.

Prof. A. B. Hart Presents His Views; Manufacturers' Record Replies.

No. 19 Craigie Street,
Cambridge, Mass., March 24, 1905.
Editor of The Times-Dispatch:

Sir—Somebody was good enough to forward me a copy of The Times-Dispatch of March 22d with an editorial upon an article which I have recently written for the Boston Transcript on the conditions of the negro race. No doubt there is ground for difference as to the main results of that discussion, but in your editorial you apply yourself only to that part of the article which alludes to the present general economic condition of the South. I should be sorry to think that any Virginian, and especially any inhabitant of Richmond, where I have received many personal kindnesses and have, I trust, some warm friends, should think that I am oblivious to the remarkable prosperity and business activity of that city. In the article under discussion, I was chiefly concerned with the condition of the negro race, especially in agricultural regions, and did not make clear that any discussion of the backwardness of the South must leave out of account the highly thrifty belt of country extending from Richmond to New Orleans and including many prosperous cities. In another article published within a few days in another periodical, I have carefully separated out that region and the State of Texas from any general criticisms on the Southern economic conditions.

Nevertheless it is only fair to say that the only available figures for comparison show that the South as a whole and many of the particular States appear to be less prosperous than they were in 1860. The basis of this generalization is the census of 1860, and the census of 1890, both of which give what we must suppose to be carefully ascertained summaries of the real and personal property assessed for taxation in all the States of the Union. The similar figures for 1901 have not been published and I have therefore been thrown upon the figures of 1890. The World's Almanac of 1905, presumably based on correspondence with the State officials, I am well aware of the imperfection of such a basis. The ratio of assessment to actual values differs much in different States, and in some of the more backward communities at different epochs, they may be accepted as a basis of rough estimates. In the use of the figures of 1860, there is a further complication owing to the fact that the slaves were assessed for taxes to an amount not possible to ascertain, but probably not less than one thousand million dollars; but in the comparisons that I make below, I have in all cases eliminated or deducted an estimate of the amount of assessments for slaves.

What are the results of these calculations, always allowing for the fact that the figures are only approximate, and that there may be some small errors in calculation? The fifteen slave-holding States in 1860 were assessed for forty-five hundred millions (leaving out slave property), of which about twenty-four hundred millions was real estate and twenty-one hundred millions personal estate; in 1890 the total assessment was fifty-five hundred millions, a gain of about twenty-five per cent., while the population had increased from twelve to twenty-two millions. That is, the per capita valuation in 1860 was about \$35; in 1890 it was \$39, and in 1901, \$50.

These figures, showing how far the South of 1901, with its population of 25,300,000, is in advance of the whole country of 1890, with its population of 31,490,000, demonstrate the marvelous progress made by the South from its position of 1860, in spite of the war and subsequent robbery and depression from which recovery hardly began in 1880. The progress made during the next twenty years and continuing to the present is indicated in the following:

	1860.	1890.
Population	21,500,000	25,300,000
Bank deposits	\$33,800,000	\$745,000,000
Railroad mileage	30,692	62,360
Pig iron, tons	884,474	2,743,313
Coal, tons	15,173,000	65,000,000
Cotton, bales	4,158,500	12,730,000
Corn, bushels	\$20,456,000	\$61,744,000
Cotton spindles	5,035,798	8,515,000
Exports, value	\$333,576,000	\$559,242,000
Property (true value)	\$16,153,000,000	\$415,000,000,000

*Estimated.
These figures, showing how far the South of 1901, with its population of 25,300,000, is in advance of the whole country of 1890, with its population of 31,490,000, demonstrate the marvelous progress made by the South from its position of 1860, in spite of the war and subsequent robbery and depression from which recovery hardly began in 1880. The progress made during the next twenty years and continuing to the present is indicated in the following:

	1860.	1890.
Population	21,500,000	25,300,000
Farm values:		
Land improvements	\$1,836,540,174	\$1,203,780,794
Implement and machinery	75,536,161	107,348,120
Livestock	377,227,383	710,502,718
Products	600,131,452	1,271,654,273
Engaged in agriculture	3,717,112	5,087,997
Manufactures:		
Capital	\$57,244,464	\$1,155,002,368
Products, value	467,643,777	1,463,843,177
Wage earners	306,467	785,119
Cotton mills:		
Spindles	967,754	6,267,181
Looms	14,323	130,220
Fig iron, tons	367,201	2,604,671
Coal, tons	6,016,471	32,678,048
Petroleum, value	\$213,397	\$2,318,105
Total mineral products, value	\$17,897,816	\$115,322,763
Capital	\$23,446,076	\$181,702,529
Value of products	\$9,620,482	\$88,114,321
Railroads, miles	20,812	62,360
Exports, value	\$41,214,904	\$64,310,913
Assessed property values	\$3,651,175,008	\$4,507,553,001
True property value	\$7,556,000,000	\$13,656,000,000

*Figures for 1882.

*Estimated.

These figures covering agricultural

and in some cases must be going backward.

His admission in the second question which contradicts the deduction in the first sentence of the first quotation, is itself contradicted by his contention in the second half of the second quotation. And there you are. What is the use of trying to meet seriously such evanescent opinion?

Again Professor Hart fails to give the full figures upon which he bases his calculations and deductions in comparison. But in the midst of the consequent confusion, one fact is quite obvious, and that is that Professor Hart has overlooked the very vital point that assessed values today represent far less of the real values than did assessed values in the census of 1860. In that year the assessed value of property in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia was \$5,159,000,000 in round numbers, and the real value was \$6,240,000,000, the assessed value being about eighty-two per cent. of the real value. These values include, of course, the values of property in slaves. During the past twenty years and more the percentage has been much less, the assessed values in 1890 being forty per cent. of the true value, and in 1890, forty-one per cent. If the same proportion is maintained to-day, the true value of southern property, basing the calculation upon figures of assessed values for 1901, furnished to the Manufacturers' Record by the Census of Southern States is more than \$15,500,000,000. The figures of assessed valuations, which may as well be compared with those of 1860, are as follows:

States.	1860.	1901.
Alabama	\$270,408,422	\$222,873,703
Arkansas	201,955,781	200,000,000
Florida	26,558,854	109,747,319
Georgia	432,823,691	\$31,147,488
Kentucky	649,688,240	\$73,674,690
Louisiana	276,850,407	251,018,941
Maryland	616,719,782	690,748,794
Massachusetts	215,765,947	271,771,707
North Carolina	481,775,715	\$15,474,444
South Carolina	176,422,338	210,331,854
Tennessee	386,163,566	428,995,302
Texas	914,007,634	1,092,887,438
Virginia	480,426,025	536,494,820
West Virginia	240,634,680	247,816,028
Total	\$5,159,000,000	\$6,240,000,000

*Figures of 1900.
Estimating the assessed valuations in 1860 at 40 per cent. of the true valuations (we are informed by the assessed valuation in Louisiana, for instance, is only about 33-1/3 per cent. of the true valuation), we may safely reckon the true valuation in all these States at \$12,600,000,000, which we really believe is an underestimate.

Nevertheless, the true value of property in the whole country in 1890 was \$13,159,000,000, or about \$14 per capita, while the value per capita in the South to-day is more than \$600. In the per capita calculation for 1890 slaves have been included both in the property values and in the population.

These points are mentioned for the purpose of suggesting the difficulties in the way of attempting to straighten out the tangle in which Professor Hart is managed to involve the question of the present prosperity of the South in comparison with that of 1860, and the question of the undoubted economic advance of the South since 1860. Professor Hart has picked out with about as much philosophy as that which would argue against economic advance in New England from certain decadent portions. But may not be amies, for the inconsistent assumption of Southern conditions to recall from the columns of the Manufacturers' Record a few indications of prosperity and progress.

First, let us compare significant and indicative facts of the South of 1901 (including Delaware or Missouri in the South), with similar facts of the whole country in 1890, as follows:

	United States.	The South.
Population	21,500,000	25,300,000
Bank deposits	\$33,800,000	\$745,000,000
Railroad mileage	30,692	62,360
Pig iron, tons	884,474	2,743,313
Coal, tons	15,173,000	65,000,000
Cotton, bales	4,158,500	12,730,000
Corn, bushels	\$20,456,000	\$61,744,000
Cotton spindles	5,035,798	8,515,000
Exports, value	\$333,576,000	\$559,242,000
Property (true value)	\$16,153,000,000	\$415,000,000,000

*Estimated.
These figures, showing how far the South of 1901, with its population of 25,300,000, is in advance of the whole country of 1890, with its population of 31,490,000, demonstrate the marvelous progress made by the South from its position of 1860, in spite of the war and subsequent robbery and depression from which recovery hardly began in 1880. The progress made during the next twenty years and continuing to the present is indicated in the following:

	1860.	1890.
Population	21,500,000	25,300,000
Farm values:		
Land improvements	\$1,836,540,174	\$1,203,780,794
Implement and machinery	75,536,161	107,348,120
Livestock	377,227,383	710,502,718
Products	600,131,452	1,271,654,273
Engaged in agriculture	3,717,112	5,087,997
Manufactures:		
Capital	\$57,244,464	\$1,155,002,368
Products, value	467,643,777	1,463,843,177
Wage earners	306,467	785,119
Cotton mills:		
Spindles	967,754	6,267,181
Looms	14,323	130,220
Fig iron, tons	367,201	2,604,671
Coal, tons	6,016,471	32,678,048
Petroleum, value	\$213,397	\$2,318,105
Total mineral products, value		